



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/522,711	03/10/2000	Takashi Kenmochi	P65138US0	6046
136	7590	12/18/2003	EXAMINER	
JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC			DANG, DUY M	
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W.				
SUITE 600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			2621	7
DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/522,711	KENMOCHI, TAKASHI
	Examiner Duy M Dang	Art Unit 2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-7,11,12,14 and 16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,8,9,13 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3+6</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I invention (Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13, and 15) in Paper No. 4 filed 3/20/03 in Paper No. 5, filed 9/29/03 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 4-7, 11-12, 14, and 16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention of Group II, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 5.
3. Amendment to officially cancel all claims being drawn to a nonelected invention in response to this Office Action is required.
4. Abstract is objected to because of the following informalities:
In line 2, delete "code" and insert "coded". Appropriate correction is required.
5. Claims 1, 8, 13 and 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:
In claim 1, line 2, delete "code" and insert "coded" and so on for claim 8 line 2, claim 13 line 3, and claim 15 line 5. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
7. Claims 1-2, and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Augenbraun et al. (US Patent No. 5,654,759, art of record filed 11/20/03, paper #6).

Regarding claim 1, Augenbraun teaches an apparatus for detecting a block noise generated on an input video signal that has been coded and decoded per pixel block (see col. 1 lines 5-10), the apparatus comprising:

a differentiator to differentiate the input video signal per pixel block to obtain a differentiated signal (i.e., the use of the pixel differences to determine the cost function mentioned in col. 2 lines 39-41 and col. 8 lines 14-23. Note the equation shown in column 8 lines 14-23, the differences between the pixel blocks A and B, and A and C refer to these claimed features);

a detector to detect impulse of the differentiated signal to obtain a detection signal carrying the impulse (i.e., the blockiness identification circuit 202 employs a cost function to identify video data corresponding to blocky frames or images mentioned in col. 7 lines 65-67 and figure 2. Note the video data corresponding to blocky frames or images refers to the so called “signal carrying the impulse”. This interpretation appears to consistent with applicant’s disclosed figure 3C and page 7 lines 19-20);

an integrator to integrate the detection signal (note that the summation shown in the cost function in col. 8 lines 14-23 function as the so called “integrator”); and

a determinator to compare the integrated detection signal and a reference signal to determined whether the block noise is generated on the input video signal (see col. 8 lines 24-28. Note the comparison between the evaluation of the cost function and the predetermined threshold).

Regarding claim 8, it is noted that this claim 8 is a method claim reciting similar features called in the apparatus claim 1. Thus, claim 8 is also rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 2 and 9, Augenbraun further teaches each pixel block has a predetermined number of pixels in both the horizontal and vertical directions of the pixel blocks (see col. 8 lines 14-23. Note the “i,j” refers to both horizontal and vertical directions and the values of 0-7 in both X and Y shown in cost function refer to the predetermined number of pixels), the integrator integrating the detection signal in the horizontal and the vertical directions for a period corresponding to the pixel block (see cost function shown in col. 8 lines 14-23. Note the right side of the equation contains summations for both horizontal and vertical directions such as X and Y. The range of 0-7 for each X and Y directions in such equation represents the so called “period corresponding to the pixel block”).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Augenbraun et al. (US Patent No. 5,654,759, art of record filed 11/20/03, paper #6).

The advanced statements with regard to Augenbraun as applied to claims 1 and 8 above are incorporated hereinafter.

Art Unit: 2621

Regarding claim 13, it is noted that this claimed cites a computer for implementing similar method steps as called for in method claim 8 above. Augenbraun fails to explicitly teach such computer. However, by using a computer for carrying such method step is well known in the art (Official Notice). By using a computer would greatly enhance computation in both time and accuracy thereby improving image quality.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the conventional teaching such as a computer in combination with Augenbraun for that reasons.

Regarding claim 15, it is noted that this claim recites a processor readable medium storing program code for causing a computer performing similar features called in apparatus claim 1.

Augenbraun fails to explicitly teach such features. However, by using such features is well known in the art (Official Notice) in order to greatly enhance computation in both time and accuracy thereby improving image quality and easily to modify.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the conventional teaching such as a computer in combination with Augenbraun for that reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 3 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2621


Claims 3 and 10 would be allowable because the cited prior art (Augenbraun) fails to teach or suggest the features of: a counter to count the number of integrated impulses of the integrated detection signal per predetermined unit of image carried by the input video signal; a plurality of delay section each delaying the counted number by a period decided based on the predetermined unit of image, thus outputting count signals for succeeding images in the predetermined unit of image, and a median section to select a middle count signal among the count signals, which is the middle in level, the middle count signal being compared with the reference signal.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duy M Dang whose telephone number is 703-305-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 6:30AM to 5:00PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo H Boudreau can be reached on 703-305-4706. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9304.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

dmd
dmd
12/10/03



LEO BOUDREAU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600